

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that **claims 4-6 and 10-12** would be **allowable** if rewritten in independent form.

While Applicant believes that all of the claims are patentable over the cited references, to expedite prosecution and place the application in condition for immediate allowance, independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of allowable claims 4-6. Claims 4-6 correspondingly are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1-3 should now be in condition for immediate allowance.

Also, to expedite prosecution and place the application in condition for immediate allowance, independent claim 7 similarly is amended to incorporate the features of allowable claims 10-12. Claims 10-12 correspondingly are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 7-9 should now be in condition for immediate allowance.

While Applicant believes that all of the claims are patentable over the cited references, to expedite prosecution and place the application in condition for immediate allowance, claim 13 is amended to include somewhat similar features as allowable claim 4. Claim 13 also has been amended to make changes in conformance with U.S. patent practice. Thus, claim 13 also is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance.

No new matter is added.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a

disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

I. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claim 13 is rejected under the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Eguchi (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,519).

Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eguchi in view of Nee (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0013425).

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eguchi in view of Nee, and further in view of Owens (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0084910).

Claims 1-3 and 7-9

As mentioned above, to expedite prosecution and place the application in condition for immediate allowance, independent claims 1 and 7 are amended to incorporate the features of allowable claims 4-6 and 10-12, respectively. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-3 and 7-9 are rendered moot.

Claim 13

Also, claim 13 is amended to include somewhat similar features as allowable claim 4. Thus, the rejection of claim 13 also is believed to be rendered moot by the above amendments.

Applicant submits that Eguchi does not disclose or suggest at least “*changing the preset stations stored in said storing if it is detected on the basis of a detection result in said detecting that the receiving states of all of said preset stations deteriorated, wherein said changing of said preset stations is performed even when said receiving apparatus is*”

in a nonuse mode, and when the receiving apparatus is made operative, the preset stations stored in said storing in the nonuse mode are used as preset stations in an operative mode of the receiving apparatus”, as recited in claim 13 (emphasis added).

Instead, Eguchi (at column 7, lines 27-52) merely discloses that:

The broadcast signal received by the antenna 1 is supplied to the tuner part 2. The tuner part 2 selects the broadcast signal of the objective broadcast frequency based on the station-selection information from the control circuit 100, for example, in response to the operation of the station-selecting key by the user and converts the selected broadcast signal into an intermediate frequency signal. ...

Therefore, for example, when the control circuit 100 selects the broadcast frequency corresponding to the operation of the station-selecting key, the control circuit 100 forms the data of frequency division ratio for selecting the broadcast frequency based on the information relating to the station selection memorized in the preset memory 21 in correspondence to the operated station-selecting key, for example, based on the information of the broadcast frequency and supplies them to the tuning part 2 (emphasis added).

In other words, Eguchi merely discloses that the control circuit 100 selects the broadcast signal in response to the operation of the station-selecting key by the user.

Eguchi clearly does not disclose or suggest “*changing the preset stations stored in said storing if it is detected on the basis of a detection result in said detecting that the receiving states of all of said preset stations deteriorated, wherein said changing of said preset stations is performed even when said receiving apparatus is in a nonuse mode, and when the receiving apparatus is made operative, the preset stations stored in said storing in the nonuse mode are used as preset stations in an operative mode of the receiving apparatus*” as recited in claim 13 (emphasis added).

Instead, Eguchi merely discloses that the control circuit 100 selects the broadcast signal in response to the operation of the station-selecting key by the user.

In fact, in the Office Action, the Examiner specifically acknowledges that “*Eguchi does not disclose wherein the receiving apparatus determines that the receiving states of all of said preset stations deteriorated, but only of individual preset stations” (see Office Action at page 3, next to last paragraph; emphasis added).*

Thus, in accordance with the Examiner’s own statement, Eguchi does not disclose or suggest this feature, as recited in claim 13.

For the foregoing reasons, Eguchi does not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection and to permit claim 13 to pass to immediate allowance.

II. FORMAL MATTERS

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner check Box 12(a)(1) of the Office Action Summary indicating that the certified copies of the priority document have been received.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone

Serial No. 10/653,974
Docket No. US01-03004
(FUJI.045)


9

number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: March 31, 2006



John J. Dresch, Esq.
Registration No. 46,672

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254